Reg. /RNP/GOA/32/2021-23

RNI No. GOAENG/2002/6410

Panaji, 27th January, 2022 (Magha 7, 1943)

SERIES II No. 44

OFFICIAL GAZETTE

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Note:- There are five Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 43 dated 20-01-2022 as follows:—

(1) Extraordinary dated 20-01-2022 from pages 1047 to 1048 regarding Notification from Goa Legislature Secretariat.

(2) Extraordinary (No. 2) dated 21-01-2022 from pages 1049 to 1052 regarding Notification from Department of Elections.

(3) Extraordinary (No. 3) dated 21-01-2022 from pages 1053 to 1058 regarding Notifications from Department of Elections.

(4) Extraordinary (No. 4) dated 21-01-2022 from pages 1059 to 1062 regarding Notifications from Department of Elections and Goa Legislature Secretariat.

(5) Extraordinary (No. 5) dated 25-01-2022 from pages 1063 to 1066 regarding Orders from Department of Elections.

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Goa Human Rights Commission

Office of the Goa Human Rights Commission

Before the Goa Human Rights Commission
Panaji-Goa

Proceeding No. 43/2021

Smt. Vaishali Revodkar,
R/o H. No. 234,
Zillabhat Waddo,
Revora, Bardez-Goa Complainant.

V/s

1) The Collector,
North Goa District,
Panaji-Goa.

2) The Block Development Officer,
Mapusa, Bardez-Goa.

3) The Secretary,
Village Panchayat Revora,
Revora, Bardez-Goa.

4) The Assistant Engineer,
Sub-Division III. W.D. VIII,
Karaswada, Mapusa-Goa Respondents.

.

Inquiry Report/Order

(13th October, 2021)

The Complaint dated 05-02-2021 was received in this Commission, with a request to extend time at the rehabilitation shelter.

2. The Complainant has stated that her house at Revora was damaged due to natural calamity when a huge tree fell on the house during the rainy season. Under the/Disaster Management Act, 2005, she was provided shelter in Government Quarters at Mapusa, till her house was repaired. She stated that she is from the Dalit family and living in the Devasthan property and the Management has given her permission to repair the same.

3. She also stated that she applied to the Revora Panchayat for NOC for the repair of the house which was forwarded to the BDO, but her application was rejected as her husband did not sign the application. She has stated that she is legally married and co-owner of the house and her husband wants to evict her from the shared household and did not sign her application. She also stated that she had earlier got relief from the JMFC under the Domestic Violence Act and her husband was refrained from evicting her.

4. The Complainant stated that she had made a fresh application to the Panchayat in respect of her equal right as co-owner of the house. In the meantime she has received letter from the authorities to vacate the Government Quarters and that no more extension would be given. She stated that she is unemployed and has two children and lives on the monthly

maintenance of Rs. 5,000/-. Hence, she approached this Commission to stop discrimination of women by the Panchayat authorities and BDO and to remove the said obstacle by getting NOC to repair the house.

5. On perusing the complaint, the Commission, by Order dated 24-02-2021 called for the report/ reply from the four Respondents.

6. The Respondent No.1 filed their reply on 25-03-2021. They stated that on 02-07-2017, a tree had collapsed killing a 10 year old boy and injuring 5 others including the present Complainant. Under the Disaster Management Act, 2005 temporary accommodation in Government Quarters were provided to the Complainant and others which was extended from time to time upto 03-02-2021. The Complainant was also given compensation of Rs. 80,000/-. The Respondent No.1 stated that the Complainant continued to stay in the temporary accommodation from 14-11-2017 to 03-02-2021 and without permission of the relevant authorities beyond 03-02-2021.

7. The Respondent No. 4 filed his report dated 19-03-2021 stating that the Complainant had been allotted "C" type Government Quarters from 14-11-2017 to 13-05-2018 and the same was extended as per the request of Additional Collector upto 03-02-2021 and the Additional Collector had informed that no further extension shall be granted.

 The Respondent No. 4 also stated that as per the procedure for allotment of Government Quarters, the Respondent No. 4 has issued notice dated 08-02-2021 to the Complainant to vacate the Quarters.

8. The Respondent No. 2 filed their reply dated 31-03-2021, relying on several documents of the Office of the BDO, Village Panchayat Revora and of the Collector, North Goa as well as letters of the Complainant. The Respondent No. 3 has not filed any reply/report in the present case.

9. On the replies of the Respondents No. 1, 2 & 4 being served on the Complainant, she filed her Rejoinder on 13-08-2021. She sought an order from this Commission directing the Respondents No. 2 & 3 to grant her NOC to repair the house, being a co-owner, She also filed further rejoinder on 18-08-2021, as she had received a fresh notice dated 16-08-2021 from the office of the Respondent No. 4 to vacate the Quarters within 3 days.

10. At the stage of hearing, the Complainant was heard in person. Shri Vinod Gawde, Head Clerk of the Respondent No. 1 and Shri Umesh Shetgaonkar, V.P. Secretary on behalf of Respondent No. 2 were also heard. Adv. Shri Neil Fernandes for Respondent No. 3 and Shri Anil Parulekar, Assistant Engineer on behalf of Respondent No. 4 were heard.

11. The Commission has gone through the records and proceedings. The Commission finds that the grievance of the Complainant is that her application for repair of the damaged house at Revora was not granted by the Village Panchayat as her husband had not signed the application.

12. The Commission has noted that the Respondent No.1, vide their letter dated 21-12-2020 to the Respondents No. 2 & 4, had directed the BDO, Mapusa to monitor the issue of repair license to the Complainant within 15 days and that the Complainant had been instructed to undertake repairs within one month. The Office of Respondent No.1 had noted that since the proposal of repair license is under consideration, the Respondent No. 4 was requested to extend the accommodation granted to the Complainant for a period of 45 days only and that no further extension shall be granted.

13. The Commission finds from the documents filed by the Respondent No. 2 that the Office of the BDO had addressed a letter dated 08-03-2021 to the Complainant that the Office had issued Memorandum to the Village Panchayat Secretary, Revora to look into the matter in accordance with law and submit compliance report to the office and the reply dated 19-02-2021 had been submitted by the Village Panchayat Secretary.

14. The Commission finds from the said reply of the Village Panchayat, Revora, dated 19-02-2021 that the application of the Complainant for house repair was rejected due to lack of documents. As per the annexed Resolution, the Panchayat passed Resolution on 10-02-2021 that the Panchayat cannot forward the file to the BDO without NOC from the house owner.

15. The Complainant had submitted before this Commission that she has strained relations with her husband against whom she has obtained relief from the JMFC, under the Domestic Violence Act, 2005 and he was refrained from evicting her from the house.

16. The documents on record indicate that the Complainant has filed the application to the Panchayat for repairs of the damaged house and has submitted the required documents including the Architect plan and NOC from the Devasthan Committee who own the property.

17. The records indicate that the Panchayat has not been inclined to grant the application for repairs only because her husband has not given his No Objection Certificate.

18. Under Section 12(a) of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993, the Commission shall (a) inquire, suo-motu or on a petition presented to it by a victim or any person on his behalf [or on a direction or order of any court] into complaint of (i) violation of human rights or abetment thereof or (ii) negligence in the prevention of such violation, by a public servant.

19. The Complainant is the co-owner of the house which was damaged by falling of a tree in 2017. She seeks permission to repair the said house. The House Tax receipt of the house stands in the name of her husband. The Village Panchayat, by not granting her permission has been negligent in performance of their duties as she is the legally married wife of Shri Vilas Revodkar.

20. The Commission finds that, in the present case, the Village Panchayat of Revora has violated the human rights of the Complainant by not forwarding her application to the BDO, for the house repairs of House No. 234 at Revora, only as her husband has also not given N.O.C.

21. After the collapse of the house, the Complainant was given Government accommodation under the Disaster Management Act, 2005, by the Respondent No. 4, on the Order of Respondent No. 1. Admittedly, as the house repairs could not be carried out, the Complainant has continued to occupy the Government accommodation on temporary basis.

22. The Commission finds that it would be appropriate to ecommend to the Panchayat to consider the grant of her application for repairs as she is the co-owner of the house and to forward the same to the BDO. So also the Commission is of the opinion that the Complainant could be permitted by the Respondents No. 1 & 4 to continue occupying the Government Quarters for a period of 60 days from the grant of permission of house repairs.

23. Accordingly, the Commission passes the following Order:

a) The Commission recommends that the Respondent No. 3 place the application for permission of house repairs of House No. 234 before the Village Panchayat of Revora for re-consideration.

b) On the re-consideration by the Village Panchayat, the same be forwarded to the BDO, Bardez for grant of permission of house repairs.

c) The Commission recommends that the Respondents No. 1 and 4 consider the extension of the permission to the Complainant to stay in the Government quarters at Colvale, T.I.P. Complex, C-3, for a further period of 60 days from the date of grant of permission by the Respondents No. 2 and 3 to the Complainant, for carrying out repairs of the house.

23. Under Section 18(e) of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993, a copy of the Inquiry Report together with the recommendations shall be send to the Respondents and the Respondents shall within a period of 60 days from today or such further time as the Commission may allow, forward their comments on the report, including the action taken or proposed to be taken there on to the Commission.

Date: 13-10-2021.

Place: Panaji-Goa.

Sd/-	Sd/-
Justice U. V. Bakre,	Desmond D'Costa
Chairperson,	Member,
Goa Human	Goa Human
Rights	Rights
Commission.	Commission.

Before the Goa Human Rights Commission
Panaji-Goa

Proceeding No. 70/2020

Shri Sanjay Kumar Puthal,
Appartmant No. 2,
Upper Ground Floor,
Mudras Mansion,
Calapor, Tiswadi-Goa Complainant.

V/s

1) The Police Inspector,
Old Goa Police Station,
Old Goa, Tiswadi-Goa

2) The Executive Engineer,
Works Div III (PHEN),
Public Works Department,
St. Inez, Panaji-Goa Respondents.

Proceeding No. 134/2020

1) Dr. Ketan Govekar,
2) Supriyanka Govekar,
Both r/o Appartment 1,
Mudras Mansion, Odlem
Bhat, Santacruz
Tiswadi-Goa Complainant.

V/s

1) The Chief Secretary,
Government of Goa,
Secretariat, Porvorim-Goa.
2) The Collector,
North Goa District,
Panaji-Goa.
3) The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Altinho, Panaji-Goa.
4) The Chief Electrical Engineer,
Electricity Department,
Panaji-Goa. Respondents.

Proceeding No. 225/2020

Shri Parash Vasant Salgonkar,
R/o Mudras Mansion,
H. No. 296, Upper Ground Floor,
Appartment No. 3, Odlem Bhat
Calapur, Santa-Cruz, Tiswadi-Goa Complainant.

V/s

1) The Police Inspector,
Old Goa Police Station,
Old Goa, Tiswadi-Goa.
2) The Health Officer,
Primary Health Centre,
Chimbel-Goa.
3) The Asistant Engineer,
Sub-Div-I, Div-III,
Public Works Department,
St. Inez, Panaji-Goa Respondents.

Proceeding No. 252/2020

Shri Sanjay Kumar Puthal,
Appartment No. 2,
Upper Ground Floor,
Resident of Mudras Mansion,
House No. 296, Vodlem Bhat,
Calapur, Santa-Cruz, Tiswadi-Goa Complainant.

V/s

1) The Assistant Engineer,
S.D.-I, W.D.-III (PHEN),
Public Works Department,
St. Inez, Panaji-Goa.

1) The Police Inspector,
Old Goa Police Station,
Old Goa, Tiswadi-Goa Respondents.

Inquiry Report

(28th September, 2021)

These 4 complaints are being disposed off by a Common Report, as each Complainant/s is residing in a seperate flat in the same building and the grievances are similar i.e. in respect of the disconnection of the water supply to the building and the disconnection of the Electricity Meter of the Common Facilities.

Proceeding No. 70/2020

2. The Complaint dated 21-04-2020 was received from the Complainant, Shri Sanjay Kumar Puthal, arising from the disconnection of common electricity meter in the Mudras Mansion Building at St. Cruz, in which the Complainant is the owner of Apartment No. 2.

3. On perusing the complaint, the Commission by Order dated 06-05-2020 called for the report from the two Respondents therein, i.e. (1) The P. I. Old Goa Police Station and (2) the Executive Engineer, W.D.-III, PWD.

4. The Respondent No.1 therein filed their reply dated 23-10-2020.

5. At the stage of arguments, the Complainant was heard. P. I., Shri Krishna Sinari on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and Shri Uttam Shetye, Assistant Engineer for the Respondent No. 2 were also heard.

Proceeding No. 134/2020

6. The Complaint dated 22-06-2020 was received from the Complainants therein, Dr. Ketan Govekar and Supriyankar Govekar, who are owners of the Apartment 1, on the second floor, by virtue of the Deed of Sale dated 12-06-2018. The complaint is in respect of the disconnection of the water supply to the Mudras Mansion, St. Cruz by the PWD and also for the disconnection by the Electricity Department of the common electricity connection.

7. On perusing the complaint, the Commission by Order dated 26-06-2020 called for the report from the four Respondents therein i.e. (1) The Chief Secretary, Government of Goa, (2) The Collector, North Goa District, (3) The Chief Engineer, PWD and (4) 'The Chief Electrical Engineer, Electricity Department.

8. The Respondent No. 4 therein filed their reply dated 27-07-2020. So also the Respondent No. 3 filed their reply on 27-07-2020 and the Respondent No. 2 filed their reply on 16-12-2020.

9. Thereafter, the Complainant filed two Rejoinders on 02-09-2020. Written arguments were filed by the Complainants therein.

10. The Commission heard the Complainants, Advocate Ms. Harsha Naik for the Respondents No.1 & 3 and Shri Atul Ghate, Assistant Engineer was heard on behalf of the Respondent No. 4.

Proceeding No. 225/2020

11. The Complaint dated 30-09-2020 was received from the Complainant, Shri Paresh Vasant Salgaonkar, about disconnection of the water supply to the building Mudras Mansion at St. Cruz, where the Complainant is in possession of the Flat No. 3.

12. On perusing the complaint, the Commission by Order dated 28-10-2020 called for the report from the three Respondents, therein, i.e. (1) The P. I. Old Goa Police Station, (2) The Health Officer, PHC, Chimbel and (3) The Asstt. Engineer, Sub-Div.-III PWD, St. Inez, Panaji.

13. The Respondent No. 3 filed their reply dated 26-11-2020. So also the Respondent No. 2 filed their reply on 02-12-2020 and the Respondent No.1 filed their reply on 11-01-2021.

14. Thereafter, the Complainant filed his Rejoinder on 15-02-2021. The Respondent No. 4 also filed his reply dated 19-08-2021.

15. The Commission heard the Complainant and Respondent No.1 in person and also heard Shri Atul Ghate, Assistant Engineer on behalf of Respondent No. 4.

Proceeding No. 252/2020

16. The Complaint dated 02-11-2020 was received from the Complainant, Shri Sanjay Kumar Puthal, for disconnection of the PWD water supply in their building Mudras Mansion.

17. On perusing the complaint, the Commission by Order dated 19-11-2020 called for the report from the two Respondents therein i.e. (1) The Assistant Engineer, W.D.-III (PHEN) and (2) The P. I., Old Goa Police Station.

18. The Respondent No. 1 filed their reply dated 04-12-2020.

19. At the stage of arguments, the Complainant herein was heard in person. Shri Uttam Shetye, Assistant Engineer for Respondent No. 1 and P. I., Shri Krishna Sinari were heard on behalf of Respondent No. 2.

20. The Commission has gone through the complaints, the replies of the Respondents, documents of the parties and submissions on behalf of the parties in each of the 4 complaints.

21. There was a common water connection to the building which had been obtained in the name of the owner of the plot, Shri Mukundraj Mudras in the year 2018.

22. The Mudras building consists of 8 flats and the PWD had released the water connection on 23-01-2018 based on the application dated 30-10-2017 and the documents produced by Shri Mukundraj Mudras.

23. The said water connection was disconnected based on his written request and after following the due process as Mukundraj Mudras had not paid the arrears of the bill of Rs. 11,625/-. The PWD has already initiated action before the Mamlatdar of Tiswadi for recovery of the arrears against Shri Mukundraj Mudras.

24. So also, CA No. 60006722825 (common utility) connection was availed by Shri Mukundraj Mudras on 23-03-2018. He applied for temporary disconnection on 12-03-2020 along the reason that an the co-occupants of the building are not contributing towards the units consumed for the common utility, such as staircase, lighting and pumping of water. The Electricity Department placed the meter under temporary disconnection vide Notification dated 18-03-2020. The outstanding bill of Rs. 233/- was paid on 26-03-2020.

25. In ***Dr. Winston Dias v/s State of Goa through Chief Secretary and 4 Ors., in Writ Petition No. 192/2008*** decided by the Division Bench of the High Court of Bombay at Goa, the Hon'ble High Court had considered the provisions contained in Chapter X-A as inserted by the Goa Public Health (Amendment) Act, 2004 incorporating Sections 94A, 94B, 94C and 94D and the guidelines in the Office Memorandum dated 22-11-2004. In para 14 therein, it was held as under:

"On close scrutiny of above referred decisions and the principles laid down by the Supreme Court for observance while determining question of constitutionality of any provision we are of the opinion that the provisions of Chapter X-A of the Act or the Guidelines laid down in the memorandum issued by the State cannot be said to be arbitrary or violative of provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution of India, Infact, the provisions contained in Section 94A(1) and 94A(2) support the objection of Article 21 of the Constitution of India. ***The object of the provision is to ensure maintenance of essential services to the public at large and promote health and***

well being of the citizen of the State of Goa. It must be observed that providing for adequate and safe drinking water is one of the essential services for a citizen. Ensuring maintenance of essential services is necessary for promoting and Protecting public health*. In the year 1981, 34th World Health Assembly in a resolution emphasized that safe drinking water is the basic element of "primary health-care" which is the key to attainment of "Health for' all by the year 2000 AD", Millennium Development Goals included safe water and sanitation as the attainable goal.* ***Lack of essential service such as electricity and water supply leads to unhygienic condition which in turn leads to serious health hazards.*** *Lack of hygienic condition may lead to disease, infections, epidemics etc. It is the responsibility of the State to keep the environment safe for its citizens. Considering, the object of the provisions, providing for water connection for such households which are not provided with water supply cannot he construed as illegal even if the structure raised is illegal.* ***Essential Services like water and electricity supply is a must to maintain basic living condition of a human being.*** *The provisions of Chapter X-A are as stated above in furtherance of protecting the guarantee provided under Article 21 r/w directive principles of State Policy particularly Clauses (e) and (f) of Article 39 and are also framed with due regard to covenants contained in Civil and Political Rights, 1966 as also the International Covenant of Economic & Social Rights of 1966 which proclaims the inherent dignity and the equal and inequitable rights of all Members of the Human Family as foundation of Justice and Peace of the world. Hence the provision made for maintaining essential supplies like water and electricity which is the basic requirement of life does not in any way violate the rights of petitioner. Rights of petitioner, if any, cannot be equated as preferred as against the basic human rights of respondent or any other person.* ***The basic human rights of an individual will have an precedence in contrast with right of an individual in respect of property or any other such right.*** *It is also to be noted that in the State of Goa, the pre-liberation Law Portaria No. 6802 relates to the Regulation of water supply within the State of Goa. Supply of water including installation of other items, are governed by the said Portaria"*

26. In the above Judgment, reference is made to the case of ***Commander Sureshwar D. Sinha and others v/s Union of India and others, 2001(3) Scale 533***, wherein the Apex Court has observed that there can be no denying the fact that right to life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution would surely include a right to clean water.

27. Section 94 A (1) empowers the Government to issue directions to any authorities, local bodies, statutory functionaries or any other functionaries discharging public functions, for the purposes of Clauses (a) and (b) of said sub-section 25 (1) of Section 94 A.

28. The provisions of Chapter X-A of the Act are quoted as below:

CHAPTER XA

"Supply of potable water, electricity and other essential services 94A. Power of Government to issue directions (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in any provisions of this Act, or in any rules, regulations, notifications, orders or in any decree or judgement of any Court, or in any law for the time being in force, **the Government may, in appropriate cases**, by order, direct any authorities, local bodies, statutory functionaries. or any other functionaries discharging public functions, - (a) **to grant, supply, provide and ensure supply of potable water, etectricity,** or such other essential services, so declared by the Government under the Goa Essential Services Maintenance Act, 1988 (Act 20 of 1989) or under any other law for the time being in force, to any person, house, structure, hut, factory, area, locality; (2) The Government may empower any of the following authorities, by a special or general order, to perform its functions under sub-section (1), namely:- (a) Health Officer of the concerned area; (b) Chief Officer of a Municipal Council or the Commissioner of a Corporation, as the case may be; (c) Director of Health Services; (d) Collector of the District; (e) Secretary to the Government, dealing with Public Health Department. (3) Upon the issuance of an order under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) by the Government, every authority, local body, statutory functionary or other functionaries and every person thereof referred to in sub-section (1) or sub-section (2), shall be bound to comply with the same and provide and facilitate the provision of potable water electricity or any other essential services, as the case may be, and for this purpose, every authority, local body, statutory functionaries or other functionaries and every person thereof, referred to in sub-section (1) or sub-section (2), shall have all powers to lay necessary lines, cables, pipes, poles, pipelines and to provide necessary infrastructure, subject to the provisions of sub-section (4) hereof:"

29. The Government of Goa issued Guidelines/ /procedure for the purpose of Chapter X-A of Goa Daman and Diu Public Health Act, 1985 on 22-11-2004 as quoted below:

"(1) An application requesting to discharge functions as specified in Clauses (a) and (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 94 A of the said Act shall be made by the applicant to the authorities/ /functionaries specified in sub-section (1) of Section 94A of the said Act or to the authorities empowered by the Government in terms of sub-section (2) of Section 94A of the said Act vide Order No. 13/144/ /87-I/PHD (Part- II) dated 25th June, 2004, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 13, dated 25-6-2004 (Extraordinary). (2) The requirement of production of No Objection Certificate from Municipal Corporation of Municipal Council or Village Panchayat, for obtaining water connection or electricity connection or sewage connection shall be waived, as the purpose of granting such connections is only the maintenance and improvement of public health i.e. purely from the angle of public health. (3) The concerned authority shall examine the applications and shall satisfy itself if necessary, by site inspection, that the water/ /power/sewage connection, as the case may be, is required purely from the angle of public health and pass such orders as deemed necessary in terms of Section 94 A of the said Act. (4) The Chief Officers of the Municipal Councils and the Commissioner, Corporation of the City of Panaji, shall exercise their powers under the said Act, within their respective jurisdictions. The Health Officers shall exercise their powers under the said Act within their respective areas, outside the jurisdiction of Municipal Councils or Municipal Corporation. (5) If the Chief Officer of the Municipal Council or the Commissioner, Corporation of the City of Panaji or the Health Officer does not act as may be required under the said Act or there is a delay in granting water/power/sewage connection, a request for such connection shall be made to the respective Collector of the District who shall exercise his powers under the said Act. (6) **The authorities** empowered under the said Act vide said Order No. 13/144/87-I/PHD (Part-II) dated 25th June, 2004 can **also initiate action suo-motu with regards to matters affecting public health and issue** directions to any person or body to comply with such directions within time specified in the order. (7) An application made shall be accompanied by an Affidavit/Undertaking stating that, (a) the applicant is the occupant of the premises, and (b) the applicant shall bear all the cost of the connections, etc. and (c) the grant of water/electricity/sewage connection being purely from the angle of health, the applicant will not claim any right including the right of possession, ownership etc., and that the applicant shall not use the fact of having water/electricity/ sewage connection under the provisions of this Act against the Government or the Owner of the House/ land in any procceeding whatsoever".

30. Guided by the above provisions and the referred judgements and in facts of the present case, where the occupunts of the building are presently deprived of the potable water supply and also of the electricity supply for the meter of common facilities affecting their health, the Commission finds that in the interest of public health and to protect their, human rights, it is necessary to issue the recommendation under Section 18(3) of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993 as under:-

"In the facts of the present case, the Commission recommends that, under Section 94A of the Goa Public Health Amendment Act, 2004, on the application of the Complainant, Shri Paresh Vasant Salgaonkar, in the Proceeding No. 225/ /2020, who shall file the application within seven days from today, in accordance with the guidelines dated 22-11-2004, the Respondent No. 2 therein, i.e., the Health Officer, Primary Health Centre, Chimbel in exercise of the powers vested in him/ /her under Section 94A(i) of the said Act, may consider the grant of the supply of potable water and electricity to the residents of the flats in the Mudras Mansion, at St Cruz, on payment of the appropriate fees and on the said Applicant undertaking to continue to pay the bills from time to time, failing which the PWD and the Electricity Department will be free to disconnect the supply".

31. Under Section 18(e) of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993, the Commission shall send a copy of the Inquiry Report together with its recommendations to the Respondent and the Respondent shall within a period of one month or such further time as the Commission may allow, forward its comments on the report, including the action taken or proposed to be taken thereon to the Commission.

32. Copy of the Inquiry Report be sent to the Respondent No. 2 in Proceeding No. 225/2020, i.e. The Health Officer, Primary Health Centre, Chimbel, calling for his comments, including the action taken or proposed to be taken within a period of two months or on or before 29-11-2021, in terms of Section 18(e) of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993.

Date: 28-09-2021.

Place: Panaji-Goa.

Sd/-	Sd/-
(Justice U.V. Bakre)	(Desmon D'Costa)
Chairperson,	Member,
Goa Human Rights	Goa Human Rights
Commission.	Commission.

Town and Country Planning Department
Tiswadi Taluka
Inward No. 1221
Date of Receipt 22/7/21

Office of the Town Planner / [illegible]
Town and Country Planning Department
[illegible] Taluka Office, [illegible] Tower
8th Floor, Patto Plaza, Panaji-Goa
Dated: 29/6/2021

Reg. A.D.

Sub: Complaint made by Mr.Ketan Govekar dated 28/08/2020, regarding compliance for removing/abating the nuisance in building called Mudras Mansion in property bearing Sy.No.154/1-A of Calapor village in Tiswadi – Taluka

Whereas, this office vide letter Ref.No.TIS/6738/CAL/TCP/10/1669 dtd.8/12/2010, issued No Objection for construction of residential building and Compound wall in property bearing Sy.No.154/1-A in village Calapor, Tiswadi - Taluka.

Whereas, this office vide letter ref.No.TIS/6738/CAL/TCP/17/833 dtd. 11/7/2017 issued Technical Clearance Order for proposed construction of building and Compound wall (Revised Plan) in property bearing Sy.No.154/1-A of Calapor village, Tiswadi- Taluka.

Whereas, this office vide letter Ref.No.TIS/6738/CAL/TCP/2017/1003 dtd.21/8/2017 issued Completion Order in property bearing Sy.no.154/1-A of Calapor village, Tiswadi-Taluka.

Whereas, this office received complaint letter dtd. 28/8/2020 from Mr.Ketan Govekar, regarding removing/abating nuisance in building called "Mudras Mansion" in property bearing Sy.No.154/1-A of Calapor village in Tiswadi – Taluka.

The site inspection was carried out by the official of this office on 11/1/2021 at 3.00 p m. and following was noticed :

1. The Compound wall on rear side is not constructed.
2. The compound wall construction on Eastern and Western side is incomplete.
3. The Gate shown on site plan are not installed at site.
4. The Open Terrace on first floor is covered with Metal sheets.
5. The flooring of apartment on second floor is not complete.
6. The Open terrace on second floor apartment no.1 on Western side is covered.

This office vide letter Ref.No.TIS/6738/CAL/TCP/2021/284 dtd. 11/2/2021 directed you to clarify on the observations made within 10 working days from receipt of the letter for which this office has not received reply till date.

This office vide letter Ref.No:TIS/6738/CAL/TCP/2021/732 dtd.23/04/2021, issued Show Cause Notice directing to clarify within 10 days as to why the [illegible] and Completion Order

provisions of the Goa Land Development and Building Construction Regulations,2010, for which this office has not received reply till date.

The above violations i.e. covering of Terrace with Metal Sheets on first floor and second floor of the said Building primarily leads to increase in FAR of Building plans approved by this office. Also, the metal staircase mounted to access the terrace floor is not shown in the building plans approved by this office. The Compound wall constructed is incomplete and gates shown in the building plans approved are not mounted at site.

In view of the above violations and on account of no reply received by this office to the Shown Cause Notice issued by this office vide letter dtd. 23/06/2021, the Technical Clearance Order ref. no.TIS/6738/CAL/TCP/17/833 dtd. 11/07/2017 and Completion Order ref. no.TIS/6738/CAL/TCP/2017/1003 dtd. 21/08/2017 stands revoked with immediate effect.

R Shirodkar
(Ritesh Shirodkar)
Dy. Town Planner

Encl: as above

To,
M/s. Mukundraj Mudras,
C-9, Building Kenkre Estate,
Santa-Cruz, Tiswadi-Goa.

Copy to:

1. The Secretary/Sarpanch,
 Office of the Village Panchayat,
 Santa-Cruz, Tiswadi-Goa.
2. Dr. Ketan Govekar,
 Second floor, Apartment No. 1,
 Mudras Mansion, House No. 296,
 Odlem-Bhat, Calapur, Santa-Cruz,
 Tiswadi-Goa.

Office of the Village Panchayat
Santa-Cruz, Tiswadi - Goa.
Pin Code : 403 005

Ref. No. VP / SC / 697 / 2021-22

Date: 21/08/2021

To
Mr. Mukundraj Mudras,
C-9, Building No. 6, Kenkre Estate ,
Santa Cruz, Goa.

Revocation Order

Sub:- Complaint made by Ketan Govekar dated 28/08/2020 regarding compliance for removing/abating the nuisance in building called Mudras Mansion in property bearing Sy. No. 154/1-A of Calapor Village in Tiswadi Taluka

Sir,

As per the Technical Clearance Order received from the Dy. Town Planner, Town & Country Planning Dept., vide No. Tis/6738/Cal/TCP/10/1669 dated 8/12/2010 reg. NOC for Proposed Construction of

residential building and Compound wall in Sy. No. 154/1-A in Village Calapur Taluka Tiswadi the Panchayat has issued Construction Licence vide No. VP/SC/Const.Permit/63/2011-2012/2795 dt 08/02/2012. The Panchayat also received Technical Clearance Order vide No TIS/6738/CAL/TCP/17/833 dt. 11/07/2017 accordingly the Village Panchayat has issued Construction Licence for Proposed Construction of Residential Building and Compound wall (Revised Plan) in Sy. No. 154/1-A of Calapor Village Taluka Tiswadi also the Occupancy certificate was issued as per the Completion Order vide No. TIS/6738/CAL/TCP/2017-18/2040 dt. 04/09/2017

Further to inform that the Village Panchayat has received letter vide No. TIS/6738/Cal/TCP/2021/1084 dt. 29/06/2021 from the Dy. Town Planner, Town & Country Planning Dept., Tiswadi Taluka office, Kamat Tower, 5th Floor, Patto Plaza, Panaji-Goa. The same was placed in the fortnightly meeting held on 17/07/2021 and vide Resolution No. 6(9) it was unanimously resolved to revoke the Construction Licence issued, vide No. VP/SC/Const.Permit/16/2017-18/970 dated 08/08/2017 for Proposed Construction of Residential Building and Compound wall (Revised Plan) in Sy. No. 154/1-A of Calapor Village Taluka Tiswadi and also the Occupancy Certificate issued vide No. VP/SC/1275/2017-18 dated 19/09/2021 stands Revoked.

(Rohidas A. Pereira)
SECRETARY
VILLAGE PANCHAYAT OF SANTA CRUZ

(Namdev J. Naik)
SARPANCH
VILLAGE PANCHAYAT OF SANTA CRUZ

Encl: As above

Copy to:

1. Ketan Govekar, Apartment No. 1, Second floor, Mudras Mansion, House No. 296, Vodlem Bhat, Calapur, Santa-Cruz, Tiswadi-Goa.
2. The Dy. Town Planner.

Before the Goa Human Rights Commission
Panaji-Goa

Proceeding No. 104/2020

Suo Motu

V/s

1) The Director,
Directorate of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship,
Government of Goa,
Patto, Panaji-Goa.

2) Shri Naresh Talatkar,
ITI Instructor,
Mapusa, Bardez-Goa.

Inquiry Report/Order

(06th October, 2021)

On going through the Newspaper Report which appeared in the local daily "Gomantak Times" dated 25-05-2020 under the caption "ITI Instructor cry for revised pay scales", the Commission, by Order dated 26-05-2020 took Suo Motu cognizance of the Newspaper Report and called for the detailed report from the Respondent No. 1.

2. The Respondent No. 1 filed their detailed reply on 28-07-2020. They stated that in the year 2016, the Vocational Instructors, who were drawing Rs. 4,200/-, Grade Pay and working in various Government ITIs, represented to the office to grant them Rs. 4,600/- Grade Pay as per the MSD&E guidelines. The proposal was moved to the Finance Department on 26-10-2016 but was turned down by the Finance Minister/C.M.

3. The Respondent No. 1 also stated that they received the representation from one Vocational Instructor on 26-04-2017 and the file remained pending in the cupboard of Office Superintendent but the file has now been traced out.

4. The Respondent No.1 stated that the Department made all the efforts to give justice to the Vocational Instructors in granting them Rs. 4,600/- Grade Pay as per MSD&E guidelines but the proposal was not approved by the Higher Authorities as there was no financial assistance from the Central Government and the implementation cannot be carried out.

5. On considering the reply, this Commission passed the Order on 06-08-2020, which is recorded in the Proceeding Sheet and which is as under:

"In this case, newspaper report reveals that Naresh Talkatkar, a vocational instructor had made a representation to the Principal of Government ITI regarding revision of pay band i.e. 9300-34800+4600 to all instructors as per

the notification of Ministry of Labour and Employment (DGET)) New Delhi and that Government has not implemented the pay scales and pay grade of all the vocational instructors since the issue of notification dated November 27, 2014.

In this regard, the Finance Department opined as under:-

That similar case of vocational instructors of Directorate of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship were drawing grade pay of Rs. 4,200/- and submitted their representation for grant of grade pay of Rs. 4,600/- as per MSD&E guidelines. The same was referred to the Government for consideration. However, Finance Department returned the proposal stating that "at Present, it is not admissible to upgrade any pay scales, specially when there is no financial assistance from Govt. of India" (Pg. 5/N) and therefore, representation of Shri Zambaulikar for grade pay of Rs. 4,600/- to vocational instructors was rejected on the ground that specially there is no financial assistance from the Central Government and that circumstances based on the observation have not been changed.

That being the policy of the Government, no human rights issue is involved.

However, it is seen that the order of the Finance Department is of the year 2016/2017 (pg. 4/N and 7/N) and however, records do not show what has happened to the representation of Shri Naresh Talkatkar stated to have made to the Principal of Government ITI, Panaji, seeking implementation of notification dated 27-11-2014 (see newspaper report).

Records show that no steps have been taken by Directorate of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship to the representation of Shri Naresh Talkatkar.

The file re-submitted to the Hon'ble Chief Minister on 06-09-2017, which in turn forwarded by the Secretary (SD&E) on 07-09-2017, to Personnel Department for their views, was returned back to the Department (Skill Development and Entrepreneurship) with the remark to refer the proposal to Finance Department (R&C) to seek their views for up-gradation of grade pay.

According to Department, the report prepared on 23-11-2017 was placed on 27-11-2017 before the Director with a remark, 'please speak' and that Office Superintendent did not pursue and that subsequently, Office Superintendent expired and file has been traced now.

The net result is that representation of Naresh Talkatkar is not acted upon. Apart from that, Department did not pursue the proposal prepared on 23-11-2017.

Hence, issue notice to the Respondent and to Shri Naresh Talkatkar, for hearing.

A copy of the reply filed by the Respondent be forwarded to Shri Naresh Talkatkar".

6. Thereafter, the present Respondent No. 2 was added and he filed his reply along with the documents on 10-09-2020. Subsequently, on 25-03-2021, the Respondent No.1 filed his additional Affidavit-in-Reply, along with the annexures. In the said Affidavit-in-Reply, the Respondent No. 1 stated that the file regarding pay scale of the Instructors was placed before him on 23-06-2020 and the Finance Department returned the said file with the remarks of the Under Secretary (Finance) as under:

"Decision at 5/N & 8/N refers. There are no fresh grounds for considering the proposal. We may maintain the same."

It is seen from page 27/N that the said remark was dated 15-10-2020.

7. The Commission heard Adv. Ms. Harsha Naik for the Respondent No. 1 and also heard Shri Naresh Talatkar, ITI Instructor, i.e. the Respondent No. 2.

8. As per the Order dated 06-08-2020 of this Commission, the Commission had noted that the representation of Respondent No. 2 was not acted upon.

9. It is seen that Order of the Finance Department is of the year 2016-2017 dated 17-11-2016 and 23-05-2017 respectively, turning down the proposal by the Finance Minister (Chief Minister). It is admitted position that thereafter on 26-04-2017, one more representation was made to the Chief Minister, Government Goa, by Shri Naresh Talkatkar seeking implementation of the notification dated 27-11-2014. Records show that file re-submitted to the Hon'ble Chief Minister on 06-09-2017, which in turn forwarded by the Secretary (SD&E) on 07-09-2017 to Personnel Department for their views, was returned back to the Department of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship with the remark to refer the proposal to Finance Department (R & C) to seek their views for up-gradation of grade pay.

10. The point for determination is as to whether representation dated 06-09-2017 of which the report was prepared on 23- 11-2017, was placed on 27-11-2017, before the Director with a remark, 'Please speak' was acted on diligently.

 The averments made by Shri Dipak S. Desai, Director of Directorate of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship, Panaji-Goa are not satisfactory and are untenable. Office Superintendent Late Smt. Mahima Binghekar expired on 15-03-2019. There is considerable delay of more than one and a half year in just forwarding the file to the Finance Department, of which report was already prepared.

11. The Department cannot take shelter of death of Office Superintendent on 15-03-2019, in respect of forwarding representation dated 06-09-2017, very belatedly.

12. Even thereafter representation dated 06-09-2017, was not forwarded to the Finance Department within, reasonable time and the same was filed on 16-07-2020, after this Commission has taken cognizance of the issue. There is considerable delay in forwarding the representation to the. Finance Department. The reasons cited for delay cannot be countenanced. The Department did not provide for delivery of public services within the stipulated time limit and this resulted in administrative inefficiency. Maximum time limit provided by The Goa (Right of Citizens to Time-Bound Delivery of Public Services) Act, 2013, is ranging from 03 days to 15 days relating to such services. There is gross delay of almost three years. The death of Office Superintendent on 15-03-2019 cannot be the reason for not forwarding the representation earlier and thereafter after her death.

13. The gross and considerable delay has affected the human rights of the applicant in raising his grievances. Hence, this Commission recommends that the Respondent No. 1 hold an inquiry for fixing the accountability of long and considerable delay and to initiate action against the erring officer as deemed fit.

14. Under Section 18(e) of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993, the Commission shall send a copy of the Inquiry Report together with its recommendations to the Respondents and the Respondents shall within a period of one month or such further time as the Commission may allow, forward its comments on the report, including the action taken or proposed to be taken thereon to the Commission.

15. Copy of the Inquiry Report be sent to the Respondent No. 1 i.e. The Director, Directorate of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship, Government of Goa, Patto, Panaji-Goa, calling for their comments, including the action taken or proposed to be taken within a period of two months or on or before 07-12-2021, in terms of Section 18(e) of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993.

Date: 6-10-2021.
Place: Panaji-Goa.

Sd/-	Sd/-
Justice U. V. Bakre,	Desmond D'Costa
Chairperson,	Member,
Goa Human	Goa Human
Rights	Rights
Commission.	Commission.

Before the Goa Human Rights Commission
Panaji-Goa

Proceeding No. 104/2020

Suo Motu
V/s

1) The Director,
 Directorate of Skill Development and
 Entrepreneurship,
 Government of Goa,
 Patto, Panaji-Goa.
2) Shri Naresh Talatkar,
 ITI Instructor,
 Mapusa, Bardez-Goa.

This is regarding Inquiry Report/Order dated 06-10-2021 in Proceeding No. 104/2020 before the Goa Human Rights Commission, Panaji-Goa.

2. The Goa Human Rights Commission in the Inquiry Report/Order has directed The Director, Directorate of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship to comment in the matter including the action taken or proposed to be taken within a period of two months or before 07-12-2021.

3. The above mentioned Order was received by this office on 11-11-2021.

 Accordingly, the present comments/report is hereby submitted.

 Brief facts of the matter:

4. In the year 2016, The Principals of Govt. I.T.Is. Bicholim, Farmagudi, Mapusa, Sattari, Panaji & Pernem forwarded representations of Vocational Instructors working in their respective I.T.I.s to

the Head Office, Directorate of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship for upliftment of Grade Pay from Rs. 4200/- to Rs. 4600/- as per MSDE Guidelines. So also, similar type of applications were received from Shri Rosario Baptista, V.I.(P) and 5 others drawing Rs. 4200/- grade pay for granting of Rs. 4600/- G. Pay.

5. A proposal based on the representations of the Vocational Instructors received from the various ITIs was submitted to the Finance Department through the Hon'ble Chief Minister. However, the Addl. Secretary (Fin) turned down the proposal stating "At present it is not advisable to upgrade any pay scales especially when there is no financial assistance from GOI."

6. A representation dated 26-04-2017 addressed to the Hon'ble Chief Minister, Govt. Of Goa, by Shri Vinod Zambaulikar, Vocational Instructor(P) for up-lifting Grade Pay from Rs. 4200/- to Rs. 4600/-.

7. Subsequently, the file was once again placed before the Govt. for appropriate decision on 24-05-2017. However, the file was returned by the Secretary(SD&E) stating that "If similar case was not considered by Finance, then why it has been put up again. Plz clarify."

8. Since the representation of Shri Vinod Zambaulikar, Vocational Instructor of this Department was addressed to the Hon'ble Chief Minister, Govt. of Goa, the same was placed before the Hon'ble C.M./Minister(SD&E) through Secretary(SD&E) on 15-06-2017 for his comments in the matter. However, the file was returned by the then Hon'ble CM/Minister(SDE) with remark "As of now has the circumstances changed? If so give details."

9. The proposal was resubmitted on 30-08-2017 to the Personnel Department for their views. The file was returned back to this Department with remark "Since the financial upgradation of pay scales and grade pay is the subject matter of Finance (Revenue & Control) Department, the referring Department may refer the proposal to Finance (R&C) Department and take their views for upgradation of grade pay."

10. Again the proposal based on the representation of Shri Vinod Zambaulikar was put up before the Director (DSDE) on 23-11-2017. The then Director(SD&E), put his remark on noting "PI. Sp." to the Dy. Dir (Admn) who in turn marked it to the Office Superintendent on 27-11-2017.

11. From 27-11-2017, till another note was moved on 23-06-2020, the file was lying with the then Office Superintendent. This noting was moved based on the newspaper report dated 25-05-2020. It is stated in the noting that the file was lying in the cupboard of the then Office Superintendent who suddenly died on 15-03-2019.

12. In the meantime, sou motu proceeding was initiated by the Goa Human Rights Commission and the fact of the matter is already mentioned.

13. The Hon'ble Goa Human Rights Commission after hearing the Concerned parties issued the present Inquiry Report/Order dated 06-10-2021 with instruction to forward comments of the Director on the report, including action taken or proposed to be taken thereon to the Commission.

14. I have carefully gone throughthe concerned File No. DSDE/EST/BOHGP/2016 and I submit the comments accordingly.

15. With regard to para 12 of Inquiry Order/Report of the Goa Human Rights Commission it is submitted that the said representation dated 06-09-2017 does not come under the purview of The Goa (Right of Citizens to Time-Bound Delivery of Public Services) Act, 2013.

16. From the face of the record it can be seen that the proposal was moved to Government three times till date by the Department for considering upliftment of pay scale of Vocational Instructors from Grade Pay 4200 to Grade Pay 4600. It can be also seen that the proposal was put up before the then Director (SD&E) by Ms. Jyotsna Naik, Upper Division Clerk (UDC) by noting dated 23-11-2017 and note was put as "Pl. sp" by the then Director and file was marked to Deputy Director (Admn) who in turn marked it to Office Superintendent of this Directorate.

17. The then Office Superintendent, late Smt. Mahima Binguekar 15-03-2019 and the file was pending in her locked cupboard from 27-11-2017 till she died on 15-03-2019. The file was traced and possession of the file was taken in May/June 2020 by Ms. Jyotsna Naik, UDC. It is evident that the file was in possession of the late Office Superintendent from 27-11-2017 till her death in March 2019.

18. On going through the facts of the matter, it is seen that late Office Superintendent, Smt. Mahima Binguekar is responsible for delay of the matter.

19. However, it is seen that the dealing hand, the concerned UDC Ms. Jyotsna Naik has not made any effort to follow up the file for necessary action with the Office Superintendent or the Director nor she has taken possession of the file immediately after the death of the Office Superintendent.
20. The file was not traced and possession was not taken and no action was taken by the UDC even after 15 months after the death of the Office Superintendent.
21. Although it is not required that every representation should be submitted to the Finance Department once their decision has already been given on a similar representation as there was no change of circumstances, yet this could have been discussed with higher authorities. However, no such steps were taken by the dealing hand in this case.
22. The Director was not aware of this matter till the Notice dated 26-05-2020 was received from Human Rights Commission directing to submit detailed report in the matter.
23. As the action cannot be taken without following proper procedure laid down, it is proposed to initiate Disciplinary Proceedings against the dealing hand, the concerned UDC, Ms. Jyotsna Naik and accordingly action to be taken by following due procedure.
24. This report is submitted to the Human Rights Commission based on Inquiry Report/Order dated 06-10-2021 of the Hon'ble Commission in the matter.

Place: Panaji-Goa Sd/- Director (SD&E)
Date: 23-11-2021 Respondent No. 1

◆◆◆

Department of Home

Office of the Director General of Police

—

Order

No. ES-I(A)/Transfer of Dy. SP/2022/229

The below mentioned Dy. Superintendents of Police are hereby transferred and posted at the places indicated against their names with immediate effect in public interest:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	From	To
1.	Shri Rajendra V. Raut Dessai	SDPO, Vasco	Crime Branch, Ribandar.
2.	Shri Shaikh M. Salim	Dy. SP (Traffic North)	SDPO, Vasco.
3.	Shri Sandesh T. Chodankar	Dy. SP GRP 'A' & 'B' Coy	SDPO, Margao.
4..	Shri Uday Narayan Parab	Dy. SP SB	SDPO, Mapusa.
5.	Shri Sagar P. Ekoskar	On appointment	SDPO, Bicholim.
6.	Shri Vishwesh P. Karpe	On appointment	SDPO, Porvorim.
7.	Shri Suraj Suresh Halankar	On appointment	Dy. SP Coastal Security.
8.	Shri Dharmesh G. P. Angle	Dy. SP Konkan Railway, Margao	Dy. SP Traffic, South.
9.	Shri Santosh S. Dessai	SDPO, Panaji	SDPO, Quepem.
10.	Shri Chetan Laxman Patil	On appointment	SDPO, Ponda.
11.	Shri Harishchandra V. Madkaikar	Dy. SP Coastal Security	SDPO, Panaji.
12.	Shri Sudesh R. Naik	On appointment	Dy. SP Pernem.
13.	Shri Nelson B. R. Albuquerque	SDPO, Ponda	Dy. SP ATS.
14.	Shri Edwin M. S. Colaco	SDPO, Porvorim	Dy. SP GRP 'A' & GRP 'B'.
15.	Shri Kiran J. Poduval	SDPO, Quepem	Dy. SP Security.
16.	Shri Tushar Vernekar	On appointment	Dy. SP ANC.
17.	Shri Prabhodh B. Shirwaiker	Dy. SP (Traffic South)	Dy. SP (Traffic North).
18.	Shri Jivba G. Dalvi	On appointment	Dy. SP GRP 'D'.

2. This issues with the approval of Police Establishment Board.

Sd/- Superintendent of Police, HQ.

Panaji, 07th January, 2022.

Department of Industries

—

Order

No. 3/66/2019-IND(Part-II)/13

Government of Goa is pleased to nominate Swetika Sachan, IAS as the "Nodal Officer" to closely work with Nodal Officers of Government of India and provide requisite information on Oxygen Management Plans regularly.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Industries).

Porvorim, 19th January, 2022.

◆◆◆

Department of Tribal Welfare

Directorate of Tribal Welfare

—

Order

No. 1-114-2021-22/ADMN/DTW/5365

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Goa Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Act, 2010 (Goa Act 9 of 2010), the Government of Goa is pleased to accept the resignation tendered by Shri Ramesh B. Tawadkar, Chairperson of Goa Commission for SC/ST w.e.f. 25-01-2022.

Shri Ramesh B. Tawadkar, is hereby relieved from the post of Chairperson of Goa Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes with immediate effect.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Triveni Velip, Director (Tribal Welfare).

Panaji, 25th January, 2022.

www.goaprintingpress.gov.in

Published and Printed by the Director, Printing & Stationery,
Government Printing Press,
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403 001.

PRICE–Rs. 15.00

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA—346/150—01/2022.